

Village of Barrington
Architectural Review Commission
Minutes Summary

Date: June 9, 2005

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room
200 South Hough Street
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: John Julian III, Chairperson
Joseph Coath, Vice-Chair
Stephen Peterson, Commissioner
Karen Plummer, Commissioner
Mimi Troy, Commissioner
Marty O'Donnell, Commissioner

Staff Members: Jeff O'Brien, Senior Planner

Call to Order

Mr. Julian called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The Roll Call noted the following: John Julian III, present; Joseph Coath, present; Stephen Peterson, present; Karen Plummer, present; Mimi Troy, present; Lisa McCauley, absent. There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

Mr. Julian swore in Marty O'Donnell as a new ARC member. Mr. O'Donnell took his seat at the dias.

Mr. Julian announced that there would be a change in the order of the agenda and that ARC 05-14 Dervin Residence would be first.

New Business

ARC 05-14: Dervin Residence, 500 South Cook Street (Public Hearing - Historic)
Petitioner: Patrick Dervin, owner, and Sarah Petersen, architect

Mr. Julian swore all in who would be testifying.

Ms. Petersen presented the petition. She explained that the petitioner was proposing to replace the screens in a screen porch with Marvin double-hung windows. Ms. Petersen noted that the modification would help keep water out of the home's foundation.

Mr. Julian asked for the staff report.

Mr. O'Brien presented the staff report. He noted that staff was recommending approval.

Mr. Julian asked the ARC if they agreed that the house was contributing.

The ARC determined the home is contributing.

Ms. Troy asked if the existing windows were Marvin windows.

Ms. Petersen noted that the existing windows are the original wood, double-hung windows.

Mr. Coath asked about the glazing and if a factory screen would be used. He noted that Marvin made an all-wood screen that might be considered by the petitioner, but that the ARC does not require it.

Ms. Petersen noted that the existing storm windows were aluminum triple-track windows.

Mr. O'Brien confirmed this fact.

Mr. Julian asked for the line of the window.

Ms. Petersen noted that the windows would be Marvin Ultimate double-hung.

Mr. Julian asked about the muntins in the windows and the existing muntin patterns.

Ms. Petersen noted that the pattern in the existing windows was one-over-one and that the petitioner was attempting to differentiate the new from the old.

The ARC found that to be acceptable.

The ARC adopted staff's findings of fact.

MOTION: Ms. Plummer made a motion to approve ARC 05-14 adopting staff's findings as the ARC's. Ms. Troy seconded the motion.

Roll call:

Petersen – abstain

Plummer – yes

O'Donnell – yes

Troy – yes

Coath – yes

Julian – yes

Motion carries 5-0.

Old Business

ARC 05-07: Barrington Park District, 511 Lake Zurich Road (Public Meeting – Non-Historic)

Petitioner: Barrington Park District

Mike Williams, Williams Architects, Architect

Mr. Williams discussed the ARC's previous comments.

Mr. Julian asked for the staff report.

Mr. O'Brien presented the staff report and noted that the staff recommended approval. He noted that the aluminum cladding was appropriate in staff's opinion. Mr. O'Brien stated that the Plan Commission recommended approval of the Planned Development on the previous Tuesday.

Ms. Troy asked if aluminum was only being used on doors and windows.

Mr. Williams responded yes for maintenance purposes.

Mr. Julian asked about the path materials.

Mr. Williams noted that asphalt paving would be used along Lake Zurich Road and the paths to the universally accessible tree house. He noted the other paths would be limestone screens.

Ms. Troy asked if there was a path that lead to Jewel Pond.

Mr. Williams said yes and he pointed the paths out on the site plan. He also discussed the connection to Cuba Marsh.

Mr. Coath asked if the exposed timbers would have flashing.

Mr. Williams said yes that this detail was omitted accidentally.

Mr. Julian asked if the Historical Society had accepted the donation of the historic light fixtures.

Ms. Susan Jantorni stated that the Historical Society requested the fixtures.

Mr. Williams explained difficulties in re-using the historic light fixtures.

Ms. Troy asked about the proposed lighting fixtures.

Mr. Williams stated that they were still working with the Village on the site lighting.

Mr. O'Brien explained that the proposed lighting fixtures were included in the original packet.

Mr. Coath asked about the color of the lighting fixtures.

Mr. Williams noted that the fixtures would be black.

Mr. Julian asked for a sample of the aluminum cladding.

Mr. Williams showed the aluminum colors.

Ms. Troy asked about the stone color.

Mr. Williams explained the color of the stone.

Mr. Julian asked about the number of light fixtures.

Mr. O'Brien pointed out the light fixtures on the site plan.

Mr. Williams explained the stone piers.

There was a general direction of color of the light fixtures. The ARC determined that brown or bronze would be more appropriate than black, but that black was acceptable.

MOTION: Mr. Petersen made a motion to recommend approval ARC 05-07 adopting staff's findings as the ARC's with the condition that a cap is added over the exposed timbers. Ms. Plummer seconded the motion.

Roll call:

Petersen – yse

Plummer – yes

O'Donnell – yes

Troy – yes

Coath – yes

Julian – no

Motion carries 5-1.

New Business

ARC 05-06: Lewandowski Residence, 229 West Lincoln Avenue (Public Meeting – Historic)
Petitioner: Jim and Noreen Lewandowski, owners

Mr. Julian explained the procedures for a preliminary meeting.

Mr. Lewandowski explained the project involved tearing down and building a new detached garage as well as opening up the front porch. He stated that the porch was enclosed around 1960 and that he was proposing to remove the windows and construct new wood steps and balusters. Mr. Lewandowski explained that the existing garage was 18 feet by 18 feet and the new garage would be 22 feet by 20 feet. He stated that siding would be cementitious and that the upper level of the garage would be used for storage only.

Mr. Julian asked Mr. O'Brien if the 2004-2005 survey was provided with the packet.

Mr. O'Brien stated that it was not.

Mr. Julian asked the petitioner what the current siding of the garage was.

Mr. Lewandowski stated that garage was clad in rough-sawn vertical cedar siding.

Mr. Coath asked if the siding was beveled.

Mr. Lewandowski stated it was not.

There was a brief discussion regarding the siding on the garage.

Mr. Julian asked staff for comments.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the petitioner received setback variations for the rear and side setbacks of the structure.

Mr. Lewandowski explained why the variation was granted by the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Julian asked for questions from the commission.

Mr. Lewandowski stated that the drywall would be removed porch and the stucco would be repaired.

Ms. Troy asked if the garage doors currently had windows.

Mr. Lewandowski stated yes – he explained that the doors were original.

Ms. Troy asked if the doors could be re-used.

Mr. Lewandowski stated that they did not want use that style of door because it did not meet their needs.

Mr. Julian asked Ms. Troy if she wanted the doors reused or for the petitioner to use a similar door.

Ms. Troy stated that a similar door would be acceptable.

Mr. Lewandowski stated that they did not want windows in the garage doors because of the crime problem.

Mr. Coath asked if the petitioner had attempted adaptive reuse.

Mr. Lewandowski stated that the concrete slab was cracked and that the cost was too high to adaptively reuse the building.

Mr. Coath stated that an adaptive reuse would be more unique and historically correct. He noted that this was typically the first option the ARC explored when demolition of a structure was proposed.

Mr. Julian asked for an explanation regarding the difficulty in getting in and out of the garage.

Mr. Lewandowski explained the situation. He stated that they were proposing an 18 foot wide door as opposed to a 16 foot wide door. Mr. Lewandowski stated that he was proposing a single door and would not consider two separated bays.

Mr. Julian stated the ARC needed to make a determination on whether demolition of the garage would be allowed.

Mr. O'Donnell stated that someone from the ARC needed to go out and look at the garage. He stated that the garage looked like a nice garage from the picture, but it may not be that nice. He asked staff if a site inspection had been completed.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the property was surveyed in 2004 or 2005 from the street and that a site inspection had not been completed by staff.

Mr. O'Donnell asked if the ARC conducted site inspections.

Mr. Julian stated that the Commission performs site inspections regularly.

Mr. O'Donnell stated that he would visit the site with another commissioner.

Mr. Julian asked the petitioner if this was okay.

The petitioner stated that this was acceptable.

Mr. Coath stated that he would go as well.

Mr. Julian explained how the ARC handled demolition.

Ms. Troy asked if the demolition precluded demolition.

Mr. Julian stated that it did not.

Ms. Troy asked about the opening of the current garage door.

Mr. Lewandowski stated the opening was 16 feet, six inches.

Ms. Troy asked if a 16 foot wide door could fit in the current opening.

Mr. Lewandowski stated yes.

There was a discussion regarding adaptive reuse of the building by the ARC. Options for reuse were discussed. The Commission discussed the demolition of the garages and new garage doors.

Mr. Julian asked for the ARC consensus on the garage.

Mr. Petersen stated that more information was needed about the garage.

Mr. Julian asked about the appearance of the porch after the removal of the windows.

Mr. Lewandowski explained the modifications that would be made to the porch.

Ms. Troy asked what would be left after the windows were removed.

There was a discussion about what the porch looked like originally.

Mr. Lewandowski explained why he thought the porch had been enclosed. He stated that he did not have any old photographs of the home.

There was further discussion about the porch. The ARC determined that Commissioners Coath and O'Donnell look at the porch when they completed their site visit.

Mr. Petersen asked about the back porch as compared to the front porch.

Mr. Lewandowski explained the appearance of the back porch. He explained that the proposed front porch would look like the back porch.

The ARC discussed the porch's style relative to the house's style.

Mr. O'Donnell asked the petitioner what they thought about the garage.

Mr. Lewandowski stated that there was no rot and that the garage was basically structurally sound but that the slab was moving and that the windows and doors needed to be replaced.

Mr. Julian asked for consensus.

Mr. O'Brien read the consensus items. The following items were recommended by the ARC:

1. Windows should be provided in the garage door.
2. The ARC recommends exploring the adaptive re-use of the existing garage.
3. Provide a drawing of the proposed modifications to the front porch. The drawing should include dimensions and the proposed railings and balusters.
4. The ARC noted that the rear porch may provide more evidence regarding the original appearance of the front porch.
5. Commissioners Coath and O'Donnell will conduct a site inspection to gain more information regarding the front porch and the existing garage.

Mr. Lewandowski stated that the existing garage was too small to use for modern vehicles.

The ARC noted that drawings of the porch columns and railings would look like. They stated that an architect did not need to complete the drawings.

Ms. Troy asked about the front steps.

Mr. Lewandowski explained his plans.

Mrs. Lewandowski stated that they would include the drawings of steps in the next submittal.

Mr. O'Brien confirmed with Commissioners Coath and O'Donnell that they would contact the Lewandowskis to set up a site inspection.

Ms. Troy asked about the driveway material.

ARC 05-15: Marcan Residence, 516 South Grove Avenue (Public Meeting – Historic)
Petitioner: Ken Marcan, owner

Mr. Julian stated that the ARC would take a 3 minute recess.

The ARC returned to the dias at 8:30 pm.

Mr. Julian explained the procedure for the preliminary meeting.

Mr. Marcan explained the proposal to remodel the existing house. He noted that the front portion of the house would remain the same. Mr. Marcan noted that the house was built in 1870 and moved to the current location in the 1950s. He explained the condition of the structures on the site. Mr. Marcan noted that he was proposing to connect the existing garage to the house. Mr. Marcan noted that all of the windows would be replaced with new Marvin actual divided light windows. He noted the height of the building would meet the Zoning Ordinance after the modifications.

Ms. Plummer asked Mr. Marcan if he would be living in the house.

Mr. Marcan said yes.

Mr. Julian asked how the house was categorized in the 2004-2005 survey.

Mr. O'Brien noted that the new survey categorized this as a contributing structure.

Mr. Julian asked if the existing siding was aluminum.

Mr. Marcan said that the current siding was aluminum with stucco. He noted that new cedar siding was proposed.

Mr. Julian asked about the details.

Mr. Marcan explained what he would be doing to detail the building.

Mr. Julian asked if the petitioners had looked at 542 South Grove Avenue. He explained how that project was completed. He noted that it was a good example of massing for a new house in the Historic District. Mr. Julian noted that the attached garage was approved, but that this is usually not encouraged by the ARC.

There was a discussion of the massing of 542 South Grove.

Mr. Julian stated that the ARC was not asking the petitioners to copy 542 South Grove Avenue.

Mr. O'Donnell discussed the massing and the scale of 542 South Grove Avenue.

Mr. Marcan noted that the floor plan was the most important to him.

Ms. Plummer noted that the ARC does not look at the floor plan.

The ARC determined that the building was a contributing structure.

Mr. Julian noted that the massing and height of the building would be issues with the ARC. He noted that the garage and additions should be subordinate to the main portion of the house.

Mr. Petersen asked about the foundation of the porch.

Mr. Marcan said that the porch was on piers.

Mr. Petersen stated that screw-piles could be used to save the porch. He noted it would probably cost more to remove the porch than to repair it.

Mr. Julian asked if the plate heights were 8 feet in the rear addition.

Mr. Marcan said that the plate heights were 8 feet in the rear addition.

Mr. Julian stated that the right elevation looked like a 4-story structure. He noted that the neighbors would be concerned about that.

Mr. Coath asked if this would be the petitioner's house.

Mr. Marcan stated that this would be his house.

Mr. Coath noted that an architect with experience in historic preservation might be helpful in designing the project. He noted that the building presented many challenges. Mr. Coath stated that the front porch was contributing. He stated that raising the front portion of the roof was not appropriate. He also noted that the original stucco might be salvageable. Mr. Coath stated that it was important to maintain the scale and design of the original house. He stated that the additions should be subordinate to the original house. Mr. Coath noted that the ARC encourages detached garages.

There was a general discussion attaching the garage.

Mr. Marcan noted that the house was turned when it was moved.

The ARC discussed this fact and the impacts on the project. The ARC determined that the streetscape of should be carefully considered as the house is remodeled.

Ms. Troy noted that the different roof pitches might cause some problems. She noted that the proposed plans had too many different architectural styles. She stated that it might be more desirable to work with the styles that already exist on the home.

Mr. Marcan indicated the rooflines on the plans.

There was a discussion about how the detached garage could be modified.

Mr. O'Donnell noted that the roofline should not be raised and that the porch might have gained significance. He stated that the grade of the land would allow for a large addition.

There was discussion about other properties with similar homes and grade situations.

There was further discussion about modifications to the detached garage regarding building height and uses.

There was a discussion about the height of the principal building.

The ARC provided consensus on the following items:

1. Explore the massing of the addition. The ARC noted that the house at 542 South Grove Avenue provides an example of how a large rear addition can be appropriately massed. The ARC also cautioned that the home at 542 South Grove Avenue should not be copied.
2. The massing of the building for front elevation should have the same feel as the existing building. The ARC stated that a substantial rear addition can be constructed, but that it should not impact the streetscape of South Grove Avenue.
3. Explore the attachment of the garage. If attached, the ridgeline of the garage should be lower than the house's. The ARC recommends a detached garage and typically discourages attached garages in the Historic District.
4. The height and mass of the addition(s) should be subordinate to the original home.
5. The ARC stated that the existing rear addition may be demolished and that the original home should be preserved.
6. The "Right Elevation" appears to be a four (4) story building and should be reduced in height.
7. The front porch should be maintained as it is essential to the style of the home and may have gained historic significance on its own.

8. The roof of the original section of the house should not be raised.
9. The ARC recommends preserving the original siding material rather than replacement.
10. The overall roof mass of the building should be explored. The roof pitches should be consistent.
11. Avoid introducing too many new styles to the existing building. The ARC recommends working with the existing architectural styles.
12. The ARC recommends using an architect with experience with historic preservation.

Discussion regarding the Draft Historic Preservation Design Guidelines

Mr. O'Brien briefly described staff's comments on the guidelines. He noted that the ARC should provide comments to staff by June 23. He noted Mr. Thomason will be back to the ARC on July 14.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Petersen made a motion to approve the minutes of 2004 with modifications. Ms. Plummer seconded the motion.

Roll call noted the following:

Petersen – yes

Plummer – yes

O'Donnell – abstain

Troy – abstain

Coath – yes

Julian – yes

Motion carries.

Ms. Plummer made a motion to approve February 24, 2005 minutes. Mr. Petersen seconded the motion.

Roll call noted the following:

Petersen – yes

Plummer – yes

O'Donnell – abstain

Troy – abstain

Coath – yes

Julian – yes

Motion carries.

Mr. Petersen made a motion to approve March 31, 2005 minutes with changes. Ms. Plummer seconded the motion.

Roll call noted the following:

Petersen – yes

Plummer – yes

O'Donnell – abstain

Troy – abstain

Coath – yes

Julian – yes

Motion carries.

Planner's Report

Mr. O'Brien provided information on the future cases.

Adjournment

Ms. Plummer moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Troy seconded the motion. Voice vote noted all ayes. The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jeff O'Brien, Senior Planner

John Julian III, Chairperson
Architectural Review Commission